

Pledge of Allegiance

Present:

Present at the meeting: Chris Kerns, Ryan Lemke, Jayne Hoy, Bob Mitall, Ed Patrick, James Olszewski, Anthony Livecchi and Council Liaison Carl Stepanovich. Also in attendance was Chief Administrator Jim Morrison.

Absent:

PUBLIC HEARING – HILLSTONE VILLAGE PRD

A public hearing on Hillstone Village PRD was held at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Mitall instructed everyone on the procedure for the hearing. A stenographer was present to record the meeting. Bruce Corna, Vice President of Kacin Companies, introduced himself and Greg Kourniotis of KU Resources, Mitall Division, and advised that they were present to discuss the Hillstone Village Project, which was formerly the Torrance Building. Mr. Corna described the project, located on a 37-acre parcel on Harrison City Road, which proposes 20 single-family dwellings and 22 carriage homes. He stressed that the development is not age restricted and will have a Homeowners' Association. He described the lay-out of the plan and noted that comments were received from the Municipality prior to the last meeting, all of which have been addressed. Mr. Corna advised that a request is being made for a modification of the street width of the street to the left of the entrance from 28' to 26'. He said there is virtually no traffic on that street, which fronts the clubhouse and recreation facilities. There is also a request for reduction of the set-backs on all lots to 20', side yards on carriage homes to 10' on each side, and 15' on each side on the single-family homes. Streets will be dedicated to the Municipality, but detention basins will be maintained by the HOA. A total of 13.42 acres will be dedicated to common area. He also said, of the 37 acres, only about 16 acres will be disturbed in order to preserve the natural surroundings of the property.

Mr. Corna discussed the Municipality's active recreation requirement and how the proposed plan meets or exceeds the requirement. Wetlands, soils and environmental reports have been submitted to the Municipality. The landscape plan was presented and explained; the storm water plan, which will be submitted to the Conservation District, was explained. An agreement is in place for an off-site sanitary sewer, which is about 1,500' west of the property. All public utilities are in place and available to the property. Mr. Corna presented drawings of the single-family homes, clubhouse and carriage homes. He advised that a traffic study was completed and submitted; comments were made by the Municipality, and Kacin's traffic engineer recently spoke with Mr. Mudry regarding that issue. Applications for HOP permits have been submitted to the County (Harrison City Rd. is a county road).

Before hearing public comments, Mr. Mitall explained that the process for a PRD is different from that for a standard subdivision approval. Kacin has asked for some modifications and the public forum gives residents an opportunity to see the plans and ask questions. The approval process goes from a recommendation from the Planning Commission to Council; Council will hold another public hearing and, assuming everything is in order, will grant

tentative plan approval; the developer will then come back for a final plan approval once all permits have been received and other requirements completed. The Planning Commission will then review that plan, make a recommendation to Council, and Council will then act on that plan. Assuming that the plan is approved, the Municipality and the developer will enter into an agreement; the developer will post bonds and then proceed to construction.

Public Comment:

Cathy Friend, 2387 Harrison City Road, had concerns about the trees to be planted along the road, since she has had prior problems exiting her driveway because of overgrowth and sightline issues. Mr. Corna explained that the trees are linear deciduous trees, not sprawling maples, and they will be set back far enough to comply with sight distance requirements. Ms. Friend also had a concern about how late the clubhouse might be in use. Mr. Corna said it will be private only for the community. She also asked if there will be stop signs on Harrison City Road. Mr. Corna said not on the main road, but there will be one coming out of the development.

Rebecca Wallace, whose mother lives at 2379 Harrison City Road, asked if the homes to be built will have basements. Mr. Corna said the carriage homes will be on slabs; the single-family homes will have crawl spaces and others will have basements. Ms. Wallace's concern was whether there was going to be any blasting and possible mine subsidence. Mr. Corna said all testing has been done and they are very comfortable with where the mine is and there will not be any blasting.

Lynn Bruhn, 2365 Mt. Vernon, asked how far from the tree line at the south end of the development the homes will be built. Mr. Corna showed on the plan that there is a large section of green space and trees that will not be developed.

Lisa Schraeder, 2381 Harrison City Road, didn't hear the prior answer about mine subsidence and asked if, during construction, there is any change to the structure or integrity of her home, she would have any recourse. She asked for clarification of the location of stop signs and the request for setback and side yard reductions; asked if all homes will have garages. Mr. Corna said all homes will have 2-car garages and driveways. She asked about the view across from her home and also where the wetland area will be located. Mr. Corna answered all her questions.

David Mendlowitz, 2384 Flagstaff Drive, had a concern about the recreation area near the road because it is close to the intersection of Claridge Road and there is the possibility of accidents. Mr. Corna said there will be fencing along the area. Mr. Mendlowitz also mentioned the sight issues; Mr. Corna said the sight issues have been addressed with both Kacin's and the Municipality's traffic engineers and all requirements have been met. Mr. Mendlowitz also asked for clarification of the existing tree line and what was going to be removed. Mr. Corna answered his questions.

There were no further questions from those in attendance or the Commission members. Mr. Mitall asked Mr. Morrison if the project is ready for a recommendation to Council. Mr. Morrison said it is if it is the Commission's desire to do so. There are no outstanding issues. Ms. Hoy asked what the number of this project is. Mr. Morrison said it is PRD-1-20. Ms.

Hoy recommended that the Planning Commission moves on to Council for tentative approval Hillstone Village, PRD-1-20, which motion would include modifications to Clubhouse Court from 28' to 26', also to include the requests for setback and side yard reductions, as mentioned. Mr. Patrick seconded. As noted at a previous meeting, Mr. Mitall's division did some work on this plan so he will not be voting. All others present voted aye. Motion approved. Mr. Morrison said that Council's public hearing on this plan will be scheduled for October 21. The public hearing was closed at 7:35 p.m.

Minutes: Ms. Hoy noted corrections as follows:

Krystal Lake Subdivision should be changed to reflect Parcel A is empty; Parcel B has an existing home on it; Parcel C has an outbuilding on it. There was no motion, second or vote to approve the minutes as corrected.

Public Comment:

Joan Kerns, 4997 Longview Court, was present to address the application for active senior housing. She felt the size of the smaller apartments (600 sf) needs to be considered. She said many seniors do not want to dispose of everything and she feels this size is too small. She also had a concern about the parking space width, which is 1.2 in the B District. She feels a 9' space, for an older person, is not sufficient due to older persons possibly having health issues (arthritis, etc.) that make it more difficult to maneuver. She said she has not seen these issues mentioned when discussing the R District.

Old Business:

1. Krystal Lake Subdivision S-4-20

A gentleman from Three Rivers Development was in attendance representing the owners of the property. A few minutes were spent finding an updated subdivision plan and discussion on that plan. Mr. Kerns commented that the plan dated September 30 had a second sheet with an aerial overlay showing a lot of lots. The representative said that was done many years ago and was added simply to show the entire property and is not the current subdivision. Mr. Mitall asked when the owners intended to submit the subdivision plan and was told that Dave Jobe was going to be on the site the next day in preparation for the perk test so that the DEP module can be completed and submitted. There were issues with the accessory structure following the last meeting, so the updated plan identifies the front and side yards and the house was rotated so that the accessory structure comes into the side yard.

Ms. Hoy asked if the lot had been perked and was told that was to be done within the next few days. She assumed that the proposed septic system will be dependent upon the results of the test and was told that was correct.

Ms. Hoy moved to table this application until the November meeting (election day-meeting to be held in the Board Room). Mr. Lemke seconded. All present voted aye. Motion approved.

Following discussion of the Livengood Subdivision, the Three Rivers representative came back before the members and stated that they were under the impression that, when this plan was presented at the prior meeting, it could be potentially approved incumbent on the perk test. Since Mr. Jobe was on vacation, they came to tonight's meeting with the revised site plan thinking that it would be approved since the biggest issue was the subdivision of the three lots and getting the proposed house correctly done. With the change in weather, he asked if there was any way the plan could be approved at this meeting. Mr. Morrison said the issue is that there has to be a recordable plan and, even though the documents are presented, there must be DEP approval. There must be a recordable subdivision plan; Ms. Hoy said what was given to staff was a nice drawing but it is not in the official format with seals, etc. Mr. Morrison said that, even if the plan was in the proper form, it couldn't be recorded because there has been no DEP approval yet. Mr. Kerns said if the documents are submitted to DEP and the drawings back to the Commission, he doesn't see any problem with recommending it for approval at the November meeting.

New Business: Livengood Subdivision S-5-20

Ms. Hoy questioned why the lot line wasn't moved to the back of the parking area to gain more feet. Mr. Mitall said in MU there has to be a buffer. Ms. Hoy said that answered her question. Mr. Lemke said there is a minimum lot size area in MU. Mr. Morrison said it meets the minimum lot requirement and a non-conforming lot couldn't be subdivided. Ms. Hoy was concerned about Pinecrest Drive being 15' wide because there are single-family homes in the area and with a commercial business there, delivery trucks will be using the road. Mr. Mitall asked if Pinecrest is a public street and Mr. Morrison advised that it is. Mr. Kerns mentioned something about a right-of-way, but it was difficult to hear/understand him with the mask on. He suggested the property owner dedicate a portion of the property; Mr. Morrison asked what if the owner didn't agree to it? He said the owner would have a choice to extend the right-of-way. Mr. Mitall said the Municipality could request it but the owner wouldn't have to comply. Mr. Morrison said he would have to check but he believes the 15' is the paved portion of the road so the right-of-way may be greater.

Ms. Hoy asked how that would affect the setback. Mr. Morrison said the minimum lot size is 10,000 sf, side yards are 10'. Mr. Mitall asked what the Commission is doing with this application – are they just accepting it for review to start the clock? Mr. Morrison said that was correct and staff felt it was a simple subdivision and would not require a lot of discussion, but obviously it has. Mr. Mitall said it is inadequate to put a commercial building on a 15' roadway.

Mr. Morrison said all requirements for submission have been met. Mr. Kerns moved to accept the plan to start the clock; seconded by Mr. Lemke. All present voted aye. Motion approved.

Mr. Morrison asked if there were comments going back to the applicant. Mr. Mitall said to ask if the applicant would consider granting the Municipality additional right-of-way for Pinecrest – at least 10' – from Old William Penn to the rear of the second property.

Old Business:

2. Residential Senior Housing

Mr. Morrison said there are three items in the drop box: (1) the ordinance which reflects densities; (2) pertinent news article; (3) density calculation which he used to formulate the language for the ordinance. There was continued discussion on the density and the manner in which it was calculated. Mr. Morrison said that his question is in the number of units: in an R-3 single-family 50 acre piece of property, there is a potential of 244 lots. He said the R-1 and R-2 are fine, but the R-3 just “jumped out” at him.

Looking at the R-1 District, Mr. Mitall asked if minimum lot size is going to be in the ordinance. Mr. Morrison said that’s up to the Commission and that was where the hang-up was – multiplier or minimum lot size. Mr. Mitall said, if this is going to be done as a PRD concept, forget about minimum lot size and just base it on density. Mr. Morrison said that would work in R-1 and R-2, but in R-3, if using the multiplier, he believes 7,500 would have to be the minimum lot size. Mr. Mitall said the current PRD ordinance is based on density. Mr. Morrison said the PRD maxes that out because there can’t be more lots than what is permitted in regular zoning. Mr. Mitall said he would be content to forget the lot size and base it strictly on density. There was discussion about the multiplier: for R-1, R-2 and R-3 single-family it should be 1.5. Mr. Mitall asked what constituted multi-family. Mr. Morrison said, in going back to the text of the ordinance, R-1 has no multi-family; R-2 is 2-family dwelling and triplex; R-3 is 2-family dwelling, triplex and garden apartments.

Mr. Mitall asked if this was ready to be advanced. Mr. Morrison said if the only issue is the 1.2 and the text is ok, it will be ready to go. He said he can combine them together for one last look before a public hearing is scheduled. He will try to run it through as a curative amendment. Joan Kerns approached the podium and said that, in her opinion, 95% of the residents of Murrysville have no idea that this type of development is being considered in R-1, R-2 and R-3 Districts and it will create a drastic change in those Districts

Other Business: None

Adjournment:

Mr. Kerns: Moved to adjourn at 8:30 p.m.

Ms. Hoy: Seconded

Motion Approved: 7-0